



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,861	06/28/2001	George R. Pettit	12504.370	5645
7590	10/02/2003		EXAMINER	
			TRAVERS, RUSSELL S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
DATE MAILED: 10/02/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No. <b>09/893,861</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Pettit et al</b>
Examiner <b>R.S. Travers J.D., Ph.D.</b>	Art Unit <b>1617</b>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a)  This action is FINAL.      2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4)  Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 1-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 10-16 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11)  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a)  approved b)  disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)  All b)  Some\* c)  None of:

1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

- 15)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)      4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)      5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_      6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit:

Claims 1-16 are presented for examination.

During a telephone conversation with Susan Rosenfield on September 16, 2003 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of group II, claims 10-16. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1-9 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 10 and 12-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Lednicer.

Applicants' attention is directed to *Ex parte Novitski*, 26 USPQ2d 1389 (BOPA 1993) illustrating anticipation resulting from inherent use, absent a *haec verba* recitation for such utility. In the instant application, as in *Ex parte Novitski*, supra, the claims are directed to preventing a malady or disease with old and well known compounds or compositions. It is now well settled law that administering compounds inherently possessing a protective utility anticipates claims directed to such protective use. Arguments that such protective use is not set forth *haec verba* are not probative. Prior use for the same utility clearly anticipates such utility, absent limitations

Art Unit:

distancing the proffered claims from the inherent anticipated use. Attempts to distance claims from anticipated utilities with specification limitations will not be successful. At page 1391, *Ex parte Novitski*, supra, the Board said "We are mindful that, during the patent examination, pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 13 USPQ2d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1989). As often stated by the CCPA, "we will not read into claims in pending applications limitations from the specification." *In re Winkhaus*, 52 F.2d 637, 188 USPQ 219 (CCPA 1975)". In the instant application, Applicants' failure to distance the proffered claims from the anticipated prophylactic utility, renders such claims anticipated by the prior inherent use.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Art Unit:

Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nekam et al, Lednicer, Popper and Saum et al.

Nekam et al, Lednicer (see columns 1 and 4), Popper(see column 4, paragraph 3) and Saum et al(see column 2, paragraph 3) teach the various cyclopentanohydrophenanthrene compounds as old and well known in combination with various pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in dosage forms. These medicaments are taught as useful for treating various microbial infections, to include gram positive bacteria, gram negative bacteria, and fungus, with these uses viewed by the skilled artisan as indistinguishable from those herein claimed. Claims 11 and 13, and the primary references, differ as to:

- 1) employment of these medicaments to treat resistant bacteria, and
- 2) administration dosage of the medicaments.

Encountering resistance in the therapeutic setting, the skilled artisan would be motivated to employ known antimicrobial compounds structurally distinct from those compounds for which the resistance was observed. Possessing the instant teachings of Nekam et al, Lednicer, Popper and Saum et al, the skilled artisan would have been motivated to employ the cyclopentanohydrophenanthrene compounds therein recited to treat antibiotic resistant infective micro-organisms and enjoy a reasonable expectation of therapeutic success.

Art Unit:

Claim 11 requires a specific dose for effecting the therapeutic outcome herein envisioned. Determining the active ingredient dosage level required to effect optimal therapeutic benefit is well within the Skilled Artisan's purview and the benefits of achieving such maximization obvious, to said skilled artisan. The claims merely recite the obvious employment of old and well known active ingredients, carriers and excipients. Thus, the only issue presented in the instant application is the obviousness of the claimed conventional antimicrobial methods.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Nekam et al, Lednicer, Popper and Saum et al, as set forth for claims 10-15 above, in view of Remington's Pharmaceutical Sciences.

Remington's Pharmaceutical Sciences teach surface adhering dressings as old and well known in combination with various antimicrobial compounds, pharmaceutical carriers and excipients in dosage forms. These dressings are taught as useful for treating various microbial infections generally (see page 1899, column 2), to include gram positive bacteria, gram negative bacteria, and fungus, with these uses viewed by the skilled artisan as indistinguishable from those herein claimed. Claim 16, and the primary reference, differ as to:

- 1) concomitant employment of the dressing and the therapeutic agent

It is generally considered prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to

Art Unit:

form a composition which is to be used for the very same purpose. The idea for combining them flows logically from their having been used individually in the prior art. As shown by the recited teachings, the instant claims define nothing more than the concomitant use of two conventional anti-bacterial therapeutic agents. It would follow that the recited claims define prima facie obvious subject matter. Cf. In re Kerhoven, 626 F.2d 848, 205 USPQ 1069 (CCPA 1980).

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Russell Travers at telephone number (703) 308-4603.



**Russell Travers J.D., Ph.D.  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1617**